

REMARKS

I. Objection to Specification / Rejection under 35 USC § 101

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to the specification and for withdrawing the rejection under 35 USC § 101.

II. Claim Objection

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review and discovering the typo in claim 1. Applicant has not only corrected the typo in claim 1, but has also corrected corresponding typos in claims 7, 13 and 19. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this objection.

III. 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15, and 19 as failing to comply with the written description. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The portion of the sentence relied upon by the Examiner, *i.e.*, “the Facilitator’s web site 105 may access the Facilitator’s web site 105 over the Internet to obtain a copy of the material to be copyrighted” (underlining by Examiner) is a typo. This can be recognized since web sites do not need to access themselves over the Internet. The intended meaning is disclosed earlier in the sentence, earlier in the paragraph, in Fig. 1 and in Fig. 4.

The full sentence reads “[i]n another embodiment, the Entrepreneur 101 may provide a URL or domain name for the Entrepreneur’s web site 107 and the Facilitator’s web site 105 may access the Facilitator’s web site 105 over the Internet to obtain a copy of the material to be copyrighted.” (underlining added) The “URL” and “domain name” are stated to be for the “Entrepreneur’s web site 107” and are known by those skilled in the art as tools to “access” a web site. Thus, the first part of the sentence supports the amendment.

In addition, the original full paragraph reads:

The Facilitator’s web site 105 may also obtain the content of the Entrepreneur’s web site 107 so that the material may be submitted to the USCO 108 as part of the copyright process. (Step 401) The Facilitator’s web site 105 may obtain the material to be copyrighted using several different methods. For example, the Entrepreneur 101 may directly provide a file to the Facilitator’s web site 105. The file may be in the correct format or the Facilitator’s web site 105 may have to translate the file into a format acceptable by the USCO. (Step 402) In another embodiment, the Entrepreneur 101 may provide a URL or domain name for the Entrepreneur’s web site 107 and the Facilitator’s web site 105 may access the Facilitator’s web site 105 over the Internet to obtain a copy of the material to be copyrighted.

The first sentence teaches that “[t]he Facilitator’s web site 105 may also obtain the content of the Entrepreneur’s web site 107 so that the material may be submitted to the USCO 108 as part of the copyright process. (Step 401)” (underlining added) Thus, even ignoring the sentence with the typo, the original specification provides teachings that would convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, contemplated the Facilitator’s web site obtaining the content of the Entrepreneur’s web site.

In addition, Fig. 1 shows a communication arrow between the Facilitator’s web site 105 and the Entrepreneur’s web site 107 (not between the Facilitator’s web site and itself). (Unfortunately, Fig. 1 also has its own typos, i.e., the Facilitator’s web site 105 is titled Facilitator’s web site web site 105 and the Entrepreneur’s web site is titled Entrepreneur’s web site web site. A new drawing is being submitted to correct these typos.) Fig. 4 at Step 401 states “Receive web site data – URL or code comprising web site” which also shows that the web site data was being received, possibly through the use of a “URL.”

Applicant respectfully submits that, even disregarding the portion of the sentence with the typo, the specification as originally filed fully supports the amendments. Applicant also submits that the intended meaning of the typo is clear when considered with the rest of the sentence and the rest of the paragraph that it is in. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims in the January 22, 2009 Amendment are supported by the original specification and drawings and requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

As a notice to the Examiner, the portion of the specification cited by the Examiner was amended on page 10 of 19 in the Amendment filed on January 22, 2009. This amendment appears to have been accepted by the Examiner in the current OA. The amendment, if accepted by the Examiner, would overcome the Examiner’s rejection as the amendment to the specification very closely, but not exactly, follows the language of the amendments made to the claims.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103 (a)

The Examiner on page 4 rejected claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over www.godaddy.com, 02 February 2003 (hereinafter “Go Daddy”) in view of Glogau (US 5983351). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Application No. 10/811,678
Amendment in response to Office Action of 3/17/2009

- A. Glogau does not disclose a Facilitator's web site accessing the Entrepreneur's web site to obtain a copy of a material to be copyrighted

The OA on pages 4, 7, 9 and 11 cites Glogau col. 3, line 40 thru col. 4, line 7 and col. 9, lines 23-26 as teaching limitation C) in claims 1, 7, 13 and limitation D) in claim 19 respectively.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Glogau col. 9, lines 12-17 states:

The end user downloads (e.g., via carrier signals) or receives via shipment a copy of the registration software on electronic media at step 3. The software is loaded into the end-user's computer system where the web site (i.e., the web site files) is stored or accessible at step 4, wherein the software is subsequently executed at step 5. (underlining added)

Thus, in Glogau, it is the end-user's computer system that has access to the web site files.

In contrast, limitation C) in claims 1, 7, 13 and limitation D) in claim 19 recite that it is a Facilitator's web site accessing the Entrepreneur's web site to obtain a copy of a material to be copyrighted.

The referenced limitations are as follows:

1. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of: . . .

C) the Facilitator's web site accessing the Entrepreneur's web site to obtain a copy of a material to be copyrighted;

7. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of: . . .

C) the Facilitator's web site accessing the Entrepreneur's web site to obtain a copy of a material to be copyrighted;

13. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of: . . .

C) the Facilitator's web site accessing the Entrepreneur's web site to obtain a copy of a material to be copyrighted;

19. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of: . . .

D) the Facilitator's web site accessing the Entrepreneur's web site to obtain a copy of a material to be copyrighted;

In summation, Glogau does not teach or suggest limitation C) in claims 1, 7, 13 and limitation D) in claim 19. If a limitation is not taught or suggested by Glogau, then it is improper to combine that missing limitation with the asserted prior art of Go Daddy. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection for claims 1, 7, 13 and 19.

B. Glogau does not disclose the Facilitator's web site translating the copy of the material to be copyrighted into a format acceptable to the USCO

The OA on pages 5, 7, 9 and 11 cites Glogau col. 3, line 40 thru col. 4, line 7 as teaching limitation D) in claims 1, 7, 13 and limitation E) in claim 19. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Glogau col. 9, lines ????????? states:

The end user downloads (e.g., via carrier signals) or receives via shipment a copy of the registration software on electronic media at step 3. The software is loaded into the end-user's computer system where the web site (i.e., the web site files) is stored or accessible at step 4, wherein the software is subsequently executed at step 5. . . . The computer system via software examines the web site to ascertain the web site structure (i.e. the nodes and HTML files in FIG. 3) and identify web site components (i.e., examine the HTML tags in the web site files) to build the web site data structure (FIG. 5) at steps 7,8.. . . After processing the text objects, the next web site object is retrieved for processing at step 20. (underlining added)

Thus, in Glogau, it is the end-user's computer system that executes software that processes the web site files.

In contrast, limitation D) in claims 1, 7, 13 and limitation D) in claim 19 recite that it is a Facilitator's web site translating the copy of the material to be copyrighted into a format acceptable to the USCO.

The referenced limitations are as follows:

1. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of: . . .

D) the Facilitator's web site translating the copy of the material to be copyrighted into a format acceptable to the USCO; and

7. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of:

D) the Facilitator's web site translating the copy of the material to be copyrighted into a format acceptable to the USCO; and

13. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of:

D) the Facilitator's web site translating the copy of the material to be copyrighted into a format acceptable to the USCO; and

19. (Currently amended) A method for a Facilitator's web site to assist an Entrepreneur in creating an Internet business, comprising the steps of:

E) the Facilitator's web site translating the copy of the material to be copyrighted into a format acceptable to the USCO; and

In summation, Glogau does not teach or suggest limitation D) in claims 1, 7, 13 and limitation E) in claim 19. If a limitation is not taught or suggested by Glogau, then it is improper to combine that missing limitation with the asserted prior art of Go Daddy. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection for claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that not all of the claim limitations are shown or performed by Glogau as explained above. Applicant thus requests the allowance of all pending claims, i.e. claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19, as soon as possible. Any questions or suggestions regarding this Amendment should be directed to the undersigned attorneys for Applicants at the telephone number or email address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

The Go Daddy Group, Inc.

Date: 9/14/2009

By: /Stewart J. Womack/
Stewart J. Womack
Reg. No. 45,230
Attorney for Applicant

The Go Daddy Group, Inc.
14455 N. Hayden Road, Suite 219
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
480.505.8832
SWomack@GoDaddy.com